UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/558,152	11/23/2005	Masafumi Hirata	0033-1042PUS1	1878

2292   7590   07/02/2010
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER
SCOTT, RANDY A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2453	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/02/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 February 2010*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17,33 and 34* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-17 and 33-34* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is responsive to the communication filed 4/19/2010. Applicant's last

communication was a letter filed on 4/19/2010 requesting a re-start of the period of

response due to a defect in the Office Action mailed 3/19/2010. In light of Applicant's

request and related remarks, the Examiner will hereby re-open prosecution.

        In light of the error detected regarding the publication number in reference to Abileah et

al, an the period of response has been re-started as of the mailing date of the present

communication

CLAIM STATUS

2.   No new claim amendments or changes have been made.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office Action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained through the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art
> are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a
> person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
> negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1, 3-7, and 15 are under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abileah et al

(US 2002/0038336) in view of Sakanishi (US 6,678,888).

        Regarding claim 1 Abileah et al discloses a connector obtaining unit responsive to the

application management unit determination of the connector so as to obtain the connector (see

sec [0077], which discloses connection creation for a connector that is required to match interface requirements between an adapter and an application) and a function utilizing unit accessing a location of said function based on access information relating to the location described in information contained by said connector (see sec [0053], which teaches the connector storing functions of the target platform or program), and utilizing said function by said connector (see sec [0080], lines 3-7).

Abileah et al fails to teach a function utilizing unit accessing a location of said function based on access information relating to the location described in information contained by said connector and utilizing said function specified by said connector.

Sakanishi teaches the specified deficiencies, including an application managing unit that analyzes application data to determine information indicating a function required for executing said application (see col. 8, lines 53-61, which teaches a software management table utilized to store analyzed software information in order to determine which software is required for distribution of specific software).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Abileah et al with the general concept illustrated by Sakanishi, in order to successfully access a function for application execution with the motivation of providing the benefit of issuing transaction data based on required application specifics.

Regarding claim 3, Abileah et al discloses:

Wherein said function utilizing unit obtains result from said function by passing at least part of the information defined by said connector to said function specified by said connector (see sec [0054], lines 9-11).

Regarding claim 4, Abileah et al discloses:

Wherein said connector includes data conversion information (see sec [0019], lines 6-10), and said function utilizing unit converts data obtained from said application based on said data conversion information (see sec [0111], lines 6-9), and passes the converted data to said function (see sec [0111], lines 10-15).

Regarding claim 5, Abileah et al discloses wherein said function utilizing unit converts a result obtained from said function based on said data conversion information, and passes the converted result to said application (see sec [0059], lines 14-16).

Regarding claim 6, Abileah et al discloses wherein said application is an application outputting the result obtained from said function, converted by said function utilizing unit and passed from said function utilizing unit (see sec [0031], lines 3-6).

Regarding claim 7, Abileah et al discloses:

A first connector determining unit comparing identification information unique to said application with identification information unique to said connector when executing said application (see fig. 7 and sec [0065], lines 1-3) and determining whether said function can be utilized using said connector or not (see sec [0079], lines 13-14).

Regarding claim 15, Abileah et al discloses:

An application obtaining unit obtaining said application (see fig. 2 and sec [0038]).

5.   Claims 8 and 13-14 are under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abileah et al

(US 2002/0038336) in view of Sakanishi (US 6,678,888), further in view of Schiller et al (US

2002/0007491).

Regarding claim 8, Abileah et al discloses the limitations previously addressed.

Abileah et al fails to teach wherein said application includes unique information

customized according to the service utilization terminal, said connector includes unique

information customized according to the service utilization terminal, and said first connector

determining unit compares identification information unique to said customized application with

identification information unique to said connector, and determines whether said function can be

determined or not, using said connector when said service utilization terminal executes said

application.

Sakanishi teaches an application managing unit that analyzes application data to

determine information indicating a function required for executing said application (see col. 8,

lines 53-61, which teaches a software management table utilized to store analyzed software

information in order to determine which software is required for distribution of specific

software).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Abileah et al

with the general concept illustrated by Sakanishi, in order to successfully access a function for

application execution with the motivation of providing the benefit of issuing transaction data

based on required application specifics.

Abileah et al and Sakanishi fail to teach wherein said application includes unique

information customized according to the service utilization terminal, said connector includes

unique information customized according to the service utilization terminal, and said first connector determining unit compares identification information unique to said customized application with identification information unique to said connector, and determines whether said function can be determined or not, using said connector when said service utilization terminal executes said application.

Schiller et al teaches the specified deficiencies, including wherein said application includes unique information customized according to the service utilization terminal (see sec [0028], lines 1-3, "terminal ID"), said connector includes unique information customized according to the service utilization terminal (see sec [0028], lines 2-5), and said first connector determining unit compares identification information unique to said customized application with identification information unique to said connector (see sec [0028], lines 1-5), and determines whether said function can be determined or not, using said connector when said service utilization terminal executes said application (see sec [0028], lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Abileah et al and Sakanishi with the general concept illustrated by Schiller et al, in order to sufficiently match connectors with requested application data via connectors.

Regarding claim 13, Abileah et al discloses wherein a description of said application includes a connector condition provided with an obtaining destination for obtaining said connector (see sec [0043], lines 2-7) and at least one of information unique to said connector and information relating to said function specified by said connector (see sec [0094], lines 2-5), and

said connector obtaining unit obtains a connector satisfying said connector condition from said obtaining destination (see sec [0103], lines 1-4)

.

Regarding claim 14, Abileah et al discloses:

The terminal wherein said connector obtaining unit includes a connector selecting unit selecting a predetermined connector from a plurality of different connectors as a connector to be obtained by said connector obtaining unit when executing said application (see sec [0063], lines 5-7), and said function utilizing unit utilizes a function specified by said selected predetermined connector among a plurality of different functions specified by said plurality of different connectors (see sec [0065], lines 1-4).

6.   Claim 2 is under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abileah et al (US 2002/0038336) in view of Sakanishi (US 6,678,888), further in view of Sharma et al (US 6,976,061).

Regarding claim 2 Abileah et al discloses the limitations previously addressed.

Abileah et al fails to teach wherein said access information relating to the location described in said connector is a URI (Uniform Resource Identifier) for accessing said location.

Sakanishi teaches an application managing unit that analyzes application data to determine information indicating a function required for executing said application (see col. 8, lines 53-61, which teaches a software management table utilized to store analyzed software information in order to determine which software is required for distribution of specific software).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Abileah et al with the general concept illustrated by Sakanishi, in order to successfully access a function for application execution with the motivation of providing the benefit of issuing transaction data based on required application specifics.

Abileah et al and Sakanishi fail to teach wherein said access information relating to the location described in said connector is a URI (Uniform Resource Identifier) for accessing said location.

Sharma et al teaches the specified deficiencies (see col. 4, lines 12-14, which teaches a URI for the resource adapter provided by the connector).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Abileah et al and Sakanishi with the general concept illustrated by Sharma et al, in order to efficiently issue resources to recipients based on required execution information with the motivation of providing the benefit of transmitting services according to function requirements.

7.   Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abileah et al (US 2002/0038336) in view of Sakanishi (US 6,678,888), further in view of Trimberger et al (US 7,269,724).

Regarding claim 9 Abileah et al discloses the limitations previously addressed.

Abileah et al fails to teach wherein said connector obtaining unit obtains the connector from a holding location in a different device by accessing said holding location in said different device, and said service utilization terminal further comprises a connector storing unit storing said connector obtained from said holding location in said different device.

Sakanishi teaches an application managing unit that analyzes application data to determine information indicating a function required for executing said application (see col. 8, lines 53-61, which teaches a software management table utilized to store analyzed software information in order to determine which software is required for distribution of specific software).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Abileah et al with the general concept illustrated by Sakanishi, in order to successfully access a function for application execution with the motivation of providing the benefit of issuing transaction data based on required application specifics.

Abileah et al and Sakanishi fail to teach wherein said connector obtaining unit obtains the connector from a holding location in a different device by accessing said holding location in said different device, and said service utilization terminal further comprises a connector storing unit storing said connector obtained from said holding location in said different device.

Trimberger et al teaches the specified deficiencies, including wherein said connector obtaining unit obtains the connector from a holding location in a different device by accessing said holding location in said different device (see col. 7, lines 18-20), and said service utilization terminal further comprises a connector storing unit storing said connector obtained from said holding location in said different device (see col. 8, lines 5-8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Abileah et al and Sakanishi with the general concept illustrated by Trimberger et al, in order to successfully combine connectors with target terminals to provide for efficient application execution on the devices.

8.   Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abileah et al (US

2002/0038336) in view of Sakanishi (US 6,678,888), further in view of Jarvensivu (US

2002/0188736).

With respect to claim 10, Abileah et al teaches teaches the limitations previously

discussed.

Abileah et al fails to teach wherein said connector obtaining unit obtains the connector from a

holding location in a different device by accessing said holding location in said different device,

and said service utilization terminal further comprises a connector storing unit storing said

connector obtained from said holding location in said different device.

Sakanishi teaches an application managing unit that analyzes application data to

determine information indicating a function required for executing said application (see col. 8,

lines 53-61, which teaches a software management table utilized to store analyzed software

information in order to determine which software is required for distribution of specific

software).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Abileah et al

with the general concept illustrated by Sakanishi, in order to successfully access a function for

application execution with the motivation of providing the benefit of issuing transaction data

based on required application specifics.

Abileah et al and Sakanishi fail to teach wherein said application includes validity

information including at least one of information relating to a valid period of said application and

a number of allowed operations of utilizing said application, and said service utilization terminal

further comprises an application determining unit referring to said validity information and

determining whether said application can be executed or not.

Jarvensivu teaches the general concept of wherein said application includes validity

information including at least one of information relating to a valid period of said application and

a number of allowed operations of utilizing said application (see sec [0039], lines 2-8, which

teaches accessing applications is based upon a predetermined period of time and access to certain

applications is provided), and said service utilization terminal further comprises an application

determining unit referring to said validity information and determining whether said application

can be executed or not (see sec [0044], lines 2-6, which teaches that application execution is

permitted based on payment and a determination at the decision block).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Abileah et al

and Sakanishi with the general concept illustrated by Jarvensivu, in order to efficiently

implement a application access system based on authorization.

9.   Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abileah et

al (US 2002/0038336) in view of Sakanishi (US 6,678,888) and Jarvensivu (US 2002/0188736),

further in view of Tanaka (US 5,845,069).

With respect to claim 11, Abileah et al teaches the limitations previously discussed.

Abileah et al fails to teach wherein said connector obtaining unit obtains the connector from a

holding location in a different device by accessing said holding location in said different device,

and said service utilization terminal further comprises a connector storing unit storing said connector obtained from said holding location in said different device.

Sakanishi teaches an application managing unit that analyzes application data to determine information indicating a function required for executing said application (see col. 8, lines 53-61, which teaches a software management table utilized to store analyzed software information in order to determine which software is required for distribution of specific software).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Abileah et al with the general concept illustrated by Sakanishi, in order to successfully access a function for application execution with the motivation of providing the benefit of issuing transaction data based on required application specifics.

Abileah et al and Sakanishi fail to teach wherein said application includes validity information including at least one of information relating to a valid period of said application and a number of allowed operations of utilizing said application, and said service utilization terminal further comprises an application determining unit referring to said validity information and determining whether said application can be executed or not.

Jarvensivu teaches the general concept of wherein said application includes validity information including at least one of information relating to a valid period of said application and a number of allowed operations of utilizing said application (see sec [0039], lines 2-8, which teaches accessing applications is based upon a predetermined period of time and access to certain applications is provided), and said service utilization terminal further comprises an application

determining unit referring to said validity information and determining whether said application

can be executed or not (see sec [0044], lines 2-6, which teaches that application execution is

permitted based on payment and a determination at the decision block).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Abileah et al

and Sakanishi with the general concept illustrated by Jarvensivu, in order to efficiently

implement an application access system based on authorization.

Abileah et al, Sakanishi, and Jarvensivu fail to teach a second connector determining unit

referring to said validity information when executing said application, and determining whether

said function can be specified or not, using said connector.

The general concept of a second connector determining unit referring to said validity

information when executing said application, and determining whether said function can be

specified or not, using said connector (see col. 23, lines 28-35, which teaches a second judging

unit for determining if a command can be carried out) is well known in the art as illustrated by

Tanaka.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Abileah et al,

Sakanishi, and Jarvensivu with the general concept illustrated by Tanaka, in order to efficiently

implement a data accessing mechanism using connectors to fetch application information.

With respect to claim 12, Abileah et al teach the limitations previously discussed.

Abileah et al fails to teach wherein said connector obtaining unit obtains the connector from a

holding location in a different device by accessing said holding location in said different device,

and said service utilization terminal further comprises a connector storing unit storing said connector obtained from said holding location in said different device.

Sakanishi teaches an application managing unit that analyzes application data to determine information indicating a function required for executing said application (see col. 8, lines 53-61, which teaches a software management table utilized to store analyzed software information in order to determine which software is required for distribution of specific software).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Abileah et al with the general concept illustrated by Sakanishi, in order to successfully access a function for application execution with the motivation of providing the benefit of issuing transaction data based on required application specifics.

Abileah et al and Sakanishi fail to teach wherein said application includes validity information including at least one of information relating to a valid period of said application and a number of allowed operations of utilizing said application, and said service utilization terminal further comprises an application determining unit referring to said validity information and determining whether said application can be executed or not.

Jarvensivu teaches the general concept of wherein said application includes validity information including at least one of information relating to a valid period of said application and a number of allowed operations of utilizing said application (see sec [0039], lines 2-8, which teaches accessing applications is based upon a predetermined period of time and access to certain applications is provided), and said service utilization terminal further comprises an application

determining unit referring to said validity information and determining whether said application

can be executed or not (see sec [0044], lines 2-6, which teaches that application execution is

permitted based on payment and a determination at the decision block).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Abileah et al

and Sakanishi with the general concept illustrated by Jarvensivu, in order to efficiently

implement an application access system based on authorization.

Abileah et al, Sakanishi, and Jarvensivu fail to teach wherein said connector obtaining

unit obtains a new connector when said second connector determining unit determines that it is

impossible to specify said function, using said connector.

The general concept of wherein said connector obtaining unit obtains a new connector

when said second connector determining unit determines that it is impossible to specify said

function, using said connector (see col. 27, lines 37-41, which teaches that it is impossible for an

unrightfully selected application to be selected) is well known in the art as illustrated by Tanaka.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Abileah et al,

Sakanishi, and Jarvensivu with the general concept illustrated by Tanaka, in order to efficiently

implement a data accessing mechanism using connectors to fetch application information.

10.   Claims 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abileah et

al (US 2002/0038336) in view of Sakanishi (US 6,678,888), further in view of Thompson (US

5,465,401).

With respect to claim 16, Abileah et al teaches teaches the limitations previously

discussed.

Abileah et al fails to teach wherein said connector obtaining unit obtains the connector from a holding location in a different device by accessing said holding location in said different device, and said service utilization terminal further comprises a connector storing unit storing said connector obtained from said holding location in said different device.

Sakanishi teaches an application managing unit that analyzes application data to determine information indicating a function required for executing said application (see col. 8, lines 53-61, which teaches a software management table utilized to store analyzed software information in order to determine which software is required for distribution of specific software).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Abileah et al with the general concept illustrated by Sakanishi, in order to successfully access a function for application execution with the motivation of providing the benefit of issuing transaction data based on required application specifics.

Abileah et al and Sakanishi fail to teach the service utilization terminal being a mobile phone.

The general concept of the service utilization terminal being a mobile phone (see col. 5, lines 20-24, "mobile communication device" and col. 9, lines 20-25, "application connector") is well known in the art as illustrated by Thompson.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Abileah et al and Sakanishi with the general concept illustrated by Thompson, in order to sufficiently maintain a communication system.

With respect to claim 17, Abileah et al teaches teaches the limitations previously discussed.

Abileah et al fails to teach wherein said connector obtaining unit obtains the connector from a holding location in a different device by accessing said holding location in said different device, and said service utilization terminal further comprises a connector storing unit storing said connector obtained from said holding location in said different device.

Sakanishi teaches an application managing unit that analyzes application data to determine information indicating a function required for executing said application (see col. 8, lines 53-61, which teaches a software management table utilized to store analyzed software information in order to determine which software is required for distribution of specific software).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Abileah et al with the general concept illustrated by Sakanishi, in order to successfully access a function for application execution with the motivation of providing the benefit of issuing transaction data based on required application specifics.

Abileah et al and Sakanishi fail to teach the service utilization terminal being a TV (see col. 15, lines 23-25, "television") is well known in the art as illustrated by Thompson.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Abileah et al and Sakanishi with the general concept illustrated by Thompson, in order to sufficiently issue service utilization data to a plurality of terminals with the motivation of using application connectors in order to execute the terminal specific data.

11.   Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abileah et al (US

2002/0038336) in view of Sakanishi (US 6,678,888), further in view of Fadem (US 5,090,013).

With respect to claims 33, Abileah et al discloses a connector obtaining unit responsive to

the application management unit determination of the connector so as to obtain the connector

(see sec [0077], which discloses connection creation for a connector that is required to match

interface requirements between an adapter and an application) and a function utilizing unit

accessing a location of said function based on access information relating to the location

described in information contained by said connector (see sec [0053], which teaches the

connector storinf functions of the target platform or program), and utilizing said function by said

connector (see sec [0080], lines 3-7).

Abileah et al fails to teach a function utilizing unit accessing a location of said function

based on access information relating to the location described in information contained by said

connector and utilizing said function specified by said connector.

Sakanishi teaches an application managing unit that analyzes application data to

determine information indicating a function required for executing said application (see col. 8,

lines 53-61, which teaches a software management table utilized to store analyzed software

information in order to determine which software is required for distribution of specific

software).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Abileah et al

with the general concept illustrated by Sakanishi, in order to successfully access a function for

application execution with the motivation of providing the benefit of issuing transaction data

based on required application specifics.

Abileah et al and Sakanishi fail to teach an external function management unit responsive to the location of the required function being determined by the connector management unit to be an external location to the service utilization terminal to provide the required function from the external location so that the required function from the external location can be utilized; and an internal function management unit responsive to the location of the required function being determined by the connector management unit to be an internal location in the service utilization terminal to provide the required function from the internal location so that the required function provided from the internal location can be utilized.

Fadem teaches the specified deficiencies (see col. 4, lines 30-34, which teaches a connector located internal to the terminal of the user or an external configurations).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Abileah et al and Sakanishi with the general concept illustrated by Fadem, in order to successfully locate a specified function for wireless terminal applications data execution.

12.   Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abileah et al (US 2002/0038336) in view of Sakanishi (US 6,678,888) and Fadem (US 5,090,013), further in view of Trimberger et al (US 7,269,724).

Regarding claim 34 Abileah et al discloses the limitations previously addressed.

Abileah et al fails to teach wherein said connector obtaining unit obtains the connector from a holding location in a different device by accessing said holding location in said different device, and said service utilization terminal further comprises a connector storing unit storing said connector obtained from said holding location in said different device.

Sakanishi teaches an application managing unit that analyzes application data to determine information indicating a function required for executing said application (see col. 8, lines 53-61, which teaches a software management table utilized to store analyzed software information in order to determine which software is required for distribution of specific software).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Abileah et al with the general concept illustrated by Sakanishi, in order to successfully access a function for application execution with the motivation of providing the benefit of issuing transaction data based on required application specifics.

Abileah et al and Sakanishi fail to teach wherein said connector obtaining unit obtains the connector from a holding location in a different device by accessing said holding location in said different device, and said service utilization terminal further comprises a connector storing unit storing said connector obtained from said holding location in said different device.

Abileah et al and Sakanishi fail to teach an external function management unit responsive to the location of the required function being determined by the connector management unit to be an external location to the service utilization terminal to provide the required function from the external location so that the required function from the external location can be utilized; and an internal function management unit responsive to the location of the required function being determined by the connector management unit to be an internal location in the service utilization terminal to provide the required function from the internal location so that the required function provided from the internal location can be utilized.

Fadem teaches the specified deficiencies (see col. 4, lines 30-34, which teaches a connector located internal to the terminal of the user or an external configurations).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Abileah et al and Sakanishi with the general concept illustrated by Fadem, in order to successfully locate a specified function for wireless terminal applications data execution.

Abileah et al, Fader, and Sakanishi fail to teach wherein said connector obtaining unit obtains the connector from a holding location in a different device by accessing said holding location in said different device.

Trimberger et al teaches the specified deficiencies, including wherein said connector obtaining unit obtains the connector from a holding location in a different device by accessing said holding location in said different device (see col. 7, lines 18-20), and said service utilization terminal further comprises a connector storing unit storing said connector obtained from said holding location in said different device (see col. 8, lines 5-8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Abileah et al and Sakanishi with the general concept illustrated by Sharma et al, in order to successfully combine connectors with target terminals to provide for efficient application execution on the devices.

13.   *Response to Arguments*

14.   Applicant's arguments filed on 2/24/09 have been fully considered but are moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

A.   In response to the applicant's argument that Hayton et al (US 2002/0120679) does not teach or suggest any analysis of application data:

The applicant's argument has been considered; however, Sakanishi (US 6,678,888) has been cited with primary reference Abileah et al (US 2002/0038336). See col. 8 of Sakanishi, lines 53-61, which teaches a software management table utilized to store analyzed software information in order to determine which software is required for distribution of specific software.

B.   In response to the applicant's argument that Hayton et al (US 2002/0120679) does not teach or suggest a connector obtaining unit responsive to the application management unit determination of the connector so as to obtain the connector:

Primary reference Abileah et al discloses a connector obtaining unit responsive to the application management unit determination of the connector so as to obtain the connector (see sec [0077], which discloses connection creation for a connector that is required to match interface requirements between an adapter and an application).

C.   In response to the applicant's argument that Hayton et al (US 2002/0120679) does not teach or suggest a function utilizing unit accessing a location of said function based on access information relating to the location described in information contained by said connector:

See sec [0053] of Abileah et al, which teaches the connector storing functions of the target platform or program.

D.   In response to the applicant's argument that Reynolds does not teach every element of independent claim 33:

The proposed argument has also been considered. Claim 33 has now been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abileah et al (US 2002/0038336) in view of Sakanishi (US 6,678,888), further in view of Fadem (US 5,090,013). Fadem has been cited as a secondary reference to teach a connector located internal to the terminal of the user or external configurations (see col. 4, lines 30-34 of Fadem).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Randy A. Scott whose telephone number is (571) 272-3797. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30 am-5:00 pm, second Fridays 7:30 am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on (571) 272-6776. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/RANDY A. SCOTT/

Examiner, Art Unit 2453

20100622

/Joseph Thomas/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2453